



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,634	02/26/2007	Toshiya Okahisa	1091-0002WOUS	3850

49698 7590 04/06/2011
MICHAUD-Kinney Group LLP
306 INDUSTRIAL PARK ROAD
SUITE 206
MIDDLETOWN, CT 06457

EXAMINER

DESAI, KAUSHIKKUMAR A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3788

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

04/06/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/581,634	OKAHISA, TOSHIYA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KAUSHIKKUMAR DESAI	3788	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 11 and 12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant response submitted on 01/24/2011 has been received and its contents have been carefully considered.

Claims 1 and 12 are amended.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The references cited in the International Search Report and submitted in the initialed 1449 forwarded herewith have been considered only with respect to the drawings and the English language abstract provided therewith.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5492219 to Stupar.

As to claim 1, Stupar discloses a multi-chamber container [20', fig 5] that accommodates a plurality of agents [24, 22], comprising: an outer container body [34' defined by 26' and 28', fig 5] with an inner container body disposed therein, a plurality of filling chambers [32' and 98] to fill agents; that a communication portion [82'] that is provided in at least one of the filling chambers to cause the filling chambers in communication with one another; and an opening preventing portion [90'] that closes the communication portion in a carrying mode of the multi-chamber container [column 7-

Art Unit: 3788

8:65-67 – 1-2], wherein the filling chambers are opened in there between via the communication portion by user's operation in the carrying mode of the multi-chamber container to a use mode of the multi-chamber container [column 11:20-54], the multi-chamber container is capable of folded in two for carrying mode, and wherein the opening preventing portion is a seal [90'] which bonds between the filling chambers [32' and 34'] in the carrying mode of the multi-chamber container, and peels off by expanding [when one chamber of the container is squeezed it will expand the sealed area between the two chambers of the closed container, column 11:20-54] the folded multi-chamber container to open the filling chambers in therebetween via the communication port [82'] in a use mode of the multi-chamber container.

It is noted that the claims are directed to apparatus which must be distinguished from the prior art in term of structure rather than function. Hence, the functional limitations “to open the filling chambers in therebetween via the communication port in a use mode of the multi-chamber container” which are narrative in form have been given little patentable weight. In order to be given patentable weight, a functional recitation must be supported by the recitation in the claim of a sufficient structure to warrant the presence of the functional language. *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997). MPEP 2114. Furthermore, Product-by-Process recitations that, “peels off by expanding” have been given little patentable weight. In accordance to MPEP 2113, the method of forming or opening the device is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself. Please note that even though product-by-Process claims are limited by and defined by the

process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product, i.e. multi-chamber container with seal in therebetween, does not depend on its method of opening, i.e. peels off by expanding. *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Federal Circuit 1985). MPEP 2113.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 11 and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stupar as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US PG PUB 2004/0188281 to Iwasa et al..

As to claim 11, Stupar discloses the claimed invention except a caution member to check opening between the filling chambers. Iwasa teaches a caution member [352, fig 12]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide Stupar's multi-chamber container with caution member as taught by Iwasa to caution about / provide important information to the customer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine one known element in this case Stupar's multi-chamber container, with another, in this case Iwasa's caution member, to obtain the predictable results of cautioning about / provide important information to the customer. *KSR Int 'l v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1731, 82 USPQ2d at 1396. MPEP 2143 (A).

As to claim 12, Stupar modified in view of Iwasa discloses the caution member is attached to near the communication portion [3, fig 12], so that the caution member drops by expanding [when one chamber of the container is squeezed it will expand the

Art Unit: 3788

sealed area between the two chambers of the closed container, column 11:20-54] the folded multi-chamber container in the use mode of the multi-chamber container. It is noted that the claims are directed to apparatus which must be distinguished from the prior art in term of structure rather than function. Hence, the functional limitations “so that the caution member drops by expanding the folded multi-chamber container in the use mode of the multi-chamber container” which are narrative in form have been given little patentable weight. In order to be given patentable weight, a functional recitation must be supported by the recitation in the claim of a sufficient structure to warrant the presence of the functional language. *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997). MPEP 2114. Furthermore, Product-by-Process recitations that, “drops by expanding” have been given little patentable weight. In accordance to MPEP 2113, the method of forming or opening the device is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself. It is noted that even though product-by-Process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product, i.e. multi-chamber container with seal in therebetween, does not depend on its method of using, i.e. drops by expanding. *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (*Federal Circuit* 1985). MPEP 2113.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to amended claims 1 have been considered.

Applicant's arguments are not persuasive for the following reason: Rejection of claim 1 is

based on Stupar's multi-chamber container 20' [outer chamber 34' with two inner chambers 98 and 32', as shown in fig 5, whereas Applicants arguments are based on fig 2 and multi-chamber container 20. The arguments still deemed to be relevant have been addressed in the body of the rejections, at the appropriate locations.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

7. Prior Art not relied upon: See attached PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KAUSHIKKUMAR DESAI whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 3788

(571)270-7290. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ehud Gartenberg can be reached on 571-272-4828. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/K. D./
Examiner, Art Unit 3728
Tuesday, March 22, 2011.

/J. Gregory Pickett/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3728